



JĪVARĀJA JAINA GRANTHAMĀLĀ No. 4

General Editors

Prof. Dr. A. N. UPADHYE & Prof. Dr. HIRALAL JAIN

---

# PRAKRIT GRAMMAR OF TRIVIKRAMA

WITH HIS OWN COMMENTARY

OR

PRĀKṚTA-SABDĀNUSĀSANAM  
SAVṚTTIKAM

*Critically Edited with Various Readings, an Introduction  
and Appendices etc.*

BY

DR. P. L. VAIDYA, M.A. (Cal.), D.Litt. (Paris)

Retired Professor of Sanskrit and Allied Languages

Nowrosjee Wadia College, Poona;

Sometime Mayurbhanj Professor and Head of the Department  
of Sanskrit and Pali, Banaras Hindu University

*Published by*

JAINA SAMSKṚTI SAMRAKṢAKA SAMGHA,  
SHOLAPUR

1954

**Price Rs. Ten only**

All Rights Reserved

## JĪVARĀJA JAINA GRANTHAMĀLĀ

1. *Tiloyapaṇṇatti* of Yativṛṣabha, an Ancient Prākṛi Text dealing with Jaina Cosmography, Dogmatics etc Prākṛit Text and Hindi Translation, Part I, edited by Drs. A. N. Upadhye and H. L. Jain, Double Crown pp. 38-532, Sholapur 1943. Rs. 12
2. *Yāśastilaka and Indian Culture*, or Somadeva's Yaśas-tilaka and Aspects of Jainism and Indian Thought and Culture in the 10th Century, by Prof. K. K. Handiqui, Vice-Chancellor, Gauhati University, Double Crown, pp. 8-540, Sholapur 1949. Rs. 16
3. *Tiloyapaṇṇatti*, as above No. 1, Part II, with Indices etc., Double Crown, pp. 116-540, Sholapur 1951, Rs. 16
4. *Pāṇḍavapurāṇam* of Śubhacandra, A Sanskrit Text dealing with the Pāṇḍava Tale with Hindi Translation etc.

Printed by S. R. Sardesai, B.A., LL.B., Navin Samarth Vidyalaya's  
Samarth Bharat Press, 41 Budhwar Peth, Poona 2.  
Published by Walchand Devachand Shaha, B.A., Hony. Secretary,  
Jaina Samśṛti Samrakṣaka Sangha, Phaltan Galli, Sholapur.

श्रीः

जीवराज-जैन-ग्रन्थमालायाः चतुर्थो ग्रन्थः

ग्रन्थमालासंपादकौ

प्रा. आदिनाथ उपाध्यायः \* प्रा. हीरालालो जैनः

श्री-त्रिविक्रमदेव-विरचितं

# प्राकृतशब्दानुशासनम्

स्वोपज्ञवृत्तियुतम्

तच्च

पाठान्तर-परिशिष्टादिभिः समलंकृत्य

पुण्यपत्तनस्थ-वाडियाकॉलेजान्वितेन

तथा काशीविश्वविद्यालयस्थमयूरभञ्जप्राध्यापकपदान्वितेन

संस्कृत-प्राकृतादि-भाषाप्रधानाध्यापकेन

वैद्योपाह्वश्रीपरशुरामशर्मणा

संपादितम्

प्रकाशकः

शोलापुरीय-जैन-संस्कृति-संरक्षक-संघः

विक्रमसंवत् २०११ [ वीरनिर्वाणसंवत् २४८१ [ ऐशवीयसंवत् १९५४

[ सर्वेऽधिकाराः स्वायत्ताः ]

मूल्यं दश रूपिकाः

१९९४

## जीवराज जैन ग्रन्थमालाका परिचय

सोलापूर निवासी ब्रह्मचारी जीवराज गौतमचन्द्रजी दोशी कइ वषोंसे संसारसे उदासीन होकर धर्मकार्यमें अपनी वृत्ति लगा रहे है। सन् १९४० में उनकी यह प्रबल इच्छा हो उठी कि अपनी न्यायो-पार्जित संपत्तिका उपयोग विशेष रूपसे धर्म और समाजकी उन्नति के कार्यमें करें। तदनुसार उन्होंने समस्त भारतका परिभ्रमण कर जैन विद्वानोंसे साक्षात् और लिखित सम्मतियाँ इस बातकी संग्रह कीं कि कौन से कार्य में संपत्तिका उपयोग किया जाय। स्फुट मतसंचय करलेनेके पश्चात् सन् १९४१ के ग्रीष्म कालमें ब्रह्मचारीजीने तीर्थक्षेत्र गजपंथा (नाशिक) के शीतल वातावरणमें विद्वानोंकी समाज एकत्रित की, और उद्घापोहपूर्वक निर्णयके लिए उक्त विषय प्रस्तुत किया। विद्वत् संमेलनके फलस्वरूप ब्रह्मचारीजीने जैन संस्कृति तथा साहित्य के समस्त अंगों के संरक्षण, उद्धार और प्रचार के हेतु 'जैन संस्कृति संरक्षक संघ' की स्थापना की, और उसके लिए ३००००) तीस हजारके दानकी घोषणा कर दी। उनकी परिग्रहनिवृत्ति बढ़ती गई, और सन् १९४४ में उन्हो में लगभग २०००००) दो लाख की अपनी संपूर्ण संपत्ति संघको ट्रस्ट रूपसे अर्पण की। इसी संघके अंतर्गत 'जीवराज जैन ग्रंथमाला' का संचालन हो रहा है। प्रस्तुत ग्रंथ इसी मालाके चतुर्थ पुण्य है।

S. V. D. College

Library,

TIRUPATI.

Acc. No. 8988.

Date.....

08/01/73



ब्रह्मचारी जीवराज गौतमचन्द्रजी



## अनुक्रमणिका

प्रधानसंपादकीयं वक्तव्यम्—GENERAL EDITORS' NOTE	vii-viii
संपादक-प्राक्-कथनम्—PREFACE	ix-x
प्रस्तावना—INTRODUCTION	xi-xxxviii
संदर्भ-ग्रन्थ-लेखसूची—BIBLIOGRAPHY	xxxix-xlii
त्रिविक्रमदेव-विरचितं प्राकृतशब्दानुशासनम्	१-३४०
प्रथमं परिशिष्टम्—	
त्रिविक्रमसूत्रपाठः हेमचन्द्रीयसूत्रपाठेन सह संतुलितः	३४१-३७७
द्वितीयं परिशिष्टम्—	
सूत्राणामकारादिक्रमेण सूची	३७८-३९९
तृतीयं परिशिष्टम्—	
छन्दःछायापञ्चत्वेनाभिमतः त्रैविक्रमीयः सूत्रपाठः	४००-४१५
चतुर्थं परिशिष्टम्—	
अपभ्रंशपद्यसूची	४१६-४२१
पञ्चमं परिशिष्टम्—	
त्रिविक्रमशब्दानुशासनस्था देश्यशब्दसूची	४२२-४५६
षष्ठं परिशिष्टम्—	
धात्वादेशसूची	४५७-४७१
( अ ) संस्कृत-प्राकृत	४५७-४६१
( आ ) प्राकृत-संस्कृत	४६२-४७१
सप्तमं परिशिष्टम्—	
भरतनाट्यशास्त्रनिबद्धं प्राकृतभाषाणां स्वरूपम्	४७२-४७५
तृटिशोधनम्	४७७-४७८



## GENERAL EDITORS' NOTE

MOST of the Prakrit Grammars, perhaps with the exception of Vararuci's *Prākṛta-praṭhāśa*, have enjoyed greater popularity only in a particular region of India. This is true of Trivikrama's Prakrit Grammar (*Prākṛta-Śabdānuśāsanam savṛttikam*) as well. It marks a new epoch of the study of Prakrit grammars in Southern India. Thorough as Trivikrama's Grammar is, it immediately attracted eminent authors like Sīmharāja, Lakṣmīdhara and Appaya Dīkṣita, who commented on his Sūtras mostly drawing on his commentary; and thus quite a rich material has grown round about his grammar.

Trivikrama's Grammar had already attracted the attention of earliest Prakritists like Pischel, Laddu and others, but a critical edition of it was an urgent desideratum. Br. Jīvarāja Gautamachandraji earnestly desired that a critical edition of it with a Hindi digest should be published in the Jīvarāja Jaina Granthamālā which is started under his enlightened patronage. Dr. P. L. Vaidya was unquestionably the most worthy choice for editing this grammar. He has led the front of Prakrit studies for over a quarter of a century in India; and he is the veritable *pathi-kṛt* in editing Prakrit and Apabhraṃśa works. In him he admirably combines an old Paṇḍita and a modern orientalist; and by these qualities he has enriched the Prakrit studies. Dr. Vaidya has given to us a model edition, rich with useful Appendices. In his learned Introduction he confirms the view that Trivikrama himself is the author of Sūtras; and in addition, he has set forth his mature observations on the principles of text-constitution of Prakrit works.

The authorities of the Jivarāja Jaina Granthamālā offer their sincere thanks to Dr. P. L. Vaidya, who, despite his other heavy work and physical fatigue, completed this critical edition and kindly placed it at their disposal for publication in this Series.

The General Editors record their sense of gratitude to Br. Jivarāja Gautamachandraji for his enlightened generosity, to the members of the Trust Committee and Prabandhasamiti for their active interest in the Series, and to Dr. P. L. Vaidya for his willing and accommodative cooperation. They trust that this critical edition of Trivikrama's Grammar will give fresh impetus to the study of various problems connected with Middle-Indo-Aryan grammar and vocabulary. A Hindi Digest of Trivikrama's Grammar is being planned as a companion volume to this edition.

Vīra Nirvāṇa Day }  
26-10-1954 }

H. L. JAIN & A. N. UPADHYE  
General Editors

## PREFACE

IN the month of July 1941, my friend Dr. A. N. Upadhye, Professor of Ardhamāgadhī at the Rajaram College, Kolhapur, wrote to me to say that I should undertake a critical edition of Trivikrama's Prakrit Grammar or Prākṛta-Śābdānuśāsana with his own commentary for the Jīvarāja Jaina Granthamālā which he, along with Professor Dr. Hiralal Jain of Nagpur as Joint General Editor, was about to start at the request and under the patronage of Brahmachari Jīvarāja Gautamchandra of Sholapur. He wrote to me in that letter that though there were two earlier editions of this work in print, the one in the Grantha Pradarśanī Series was incomplete and no longer in the market, and the other in the Chaukhamba Sanskrit Series of Banaras, though available in the market, was not a satisfactory edition, because the text was not critically edited, because there was no information about the manuscripts used, and further because the edition was not formally issued to the public even to this day.

It was with some reluctance that I agreed to undertake the edition of this work, chiefly on account of my long acquaintance with the General Editors. I never then thought that the work would entail so much time and trouble for me. I must however state that the delay in its publication was entirely my fault. Of course, the collection of material took some years, but there are three main reasons for this delay. First, I had just then finished my work on Puṣpadanta's Mahāpurāṇa in Apabhraṃśa, and my experiences in editing the three big volumes of that work, almost single-handed, brought on me some fatigue. Secondly, I was called upon in 1943 to undertake the critical edition of the Karna-parvan of the Mahābhārata in the huge international undertaking of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona, which has been published only in September 1954; and thirdly, in 1947, after my retirement from the Nowrosjee Wadia College, Poona, I had to go to the Banaras Hindu University as Mayurbhanj Professor and Head of the Department of

Sanskrit and Pali. This Office and the Banaras climate brought on me further fatigue and to some extent ill-health. It was only in 1952 that I could devote my time for this work ; and had it not been for the constant pressure and encouragement from the General Editors, I might not have completed my task at all.

I must express here my deep sense of gratitude to the two General Editors, and Brahmachari Jivarajjee, and more particularly to Dr. Upadhye, who supplied to me the transcripts from Madras and Tanjore, a manuscript in Devanāgarī script from Sholapur, collations from the Kolhapur manuscript in old Kannaḍa script, which latter was a laborious task indeed ; he further lightened my work of going through the proofs as he throughout read one proof of every page, and made several useful suggestions for the improvement of the work, so much so that the credit of goodness and thoroughness of this edition must go to him. I also am glad to express my thanks to the Librarians of the Government Mss. Library at Madras, the Saraswati Mahal Library of Tanjore, and to Professor H. R. R. Aiyengar of the Oriental Institute, Mysore, for supplying to me transcripts from their libraries.

Before concluding, I must not fail to express my gratitude to the Manager and Staff of the Samarth Bharat Press, Poona, for excellent printing.

Poona  
1st November 1954 }

P. L. VAIDYA

## INTRODUCTION

THIS edition of Trivikrama's Prakrit Grammar called *Prākṛtaśabdānuśāsana* with the *Vṛtti* is based upon the following material :

### 1. PRINTED EDITIONS

G—This is a printed edition of the text in the *Grantha Pradarśanī* Series, Vizagapatam, 1896. It contains only the first chapter of Trivikrama's Grammar. This edition is based upon two Mss.; one is called ॠ which is a composite Ms. prepared partly from a palm-leaf manuscript in the possession of the teacher or father of the Editor, Venkata Ranganatha Śarma, and partly from the Saraswathi Mahal Library at Tanjore ; the other is called ॡ, a palm-leaf manuscript belonging to one Krishnamūrti Śāstri. The Editor V. R. Śarma thought that the Sūtras were in a versified form, and therefore indicated in his Sūtrapāṭha where the stanza should end. He also used Hemacandra's Prakrit Grammar and *Deśināmamāla* to check his text. In my opinion, he did not hesitate to go beyond his Mss. and emended his text so as to make it agree with the contents of Hemacandra's Grammar. This fact makes this edition as having no independent critical value.

B—This also is a printed edition issued by the *Chaukhamba* Series of Banaras. It is also based on two manuscripts, the provenance of which is not known to me. One of these is called ॠ and is incomplete, and the other is called ॡ, of which the last few folios seem to be missing. This edition gives the entire text of Trivikrama's Grammar and has several appendices and a word-index. I learn that this edition is based on material collected by the late Dr. T. K. Laddu of the Government Sanskrit College, Banaras, which, after his death, was edited by the late Professor Batuk Nath Sharma with the collaboration of Professor Baldeva Upadhyaya of Banaras Hindu University. This edition is not yet formally issued and so lacks some material information about manuscripts used etc.

## 2. MANUSCRIPTS :

We have used for this edition two transcripts, one from the Saraswathi Mahal, Tanjore, and the other from the Government Mss. Library at Madras, and two original manuscripts, one from Kolhapur written in old Kannada script and the other from Sholapur in Devanāgarī script. There are two more manuscripts of the work in the Oriental Institute, Mysore, from which some portions in transcript were obtained, rather late in the progress of this edition, but the portion used does not indicate that my text as based on the above material is much different from the Mysore Mss. In this connection I must state that for some classes of works, transcripts, which are no better than new manuscripts, do not offer real help. Photographic copies are the best, as the Editor sees with his own eyes what the manuscript records. Further, the scribes do not always decipher the original manuscript correctly, nor do they give any help at places, where it is most needed. The transcripts which I used for this edition are :

M—This is a transcript obtained from the Government Oriental Library, Madras, from its Ms. No. 15318 (बाहमीहि-सूत्रम् सङ्गति) described in their Catalogue as follows :

Substance, paper ; size 11 × 8½ inches ; pages 272. Lines 20 on a page. Character Devanāgarī ; condition good. Appearance new. The commentator is Trivikrama ; breaks off in the fourth pāda of the third adhyāya.

There is another manuscript of this work in the Library bearing No. 1549 from which the missing portion in the fourth pāda is made good. Even this manuscript is in a damaged condition.

T—This is a transcript obtained from the Saraswathi Mahal Library at Tanjore. There are three manuscripts of this work in the Library bearing Nos. 10005 (T<sub>1</sub>), 10006 (T<sub>2</sub>) and 10007 (T<sub>3</sub>). Of these T<sub>1</sub> has 155 folios, and T<sub>2</sub> 203 folios, and both are complete. T<sub>3</sub> is only fragmentary and has 25 folios. The first two Mss. are in Telugu script and T<sub>3</sub> in Grantha script. Further T<sub>1</sub> has several missing portions due to the

fact that the palm-leaves are broken and hence portions are lost. T<sub>2</sub> is slightly better preserved, and luckily for us, portions on broken leaves in T<sub>1</sub> could be filled up with the help of T<sub>2</sub>. T<sub>3</sub> breaks off at page 69 (गहरो गृध्रः). All the three Mss. show peculiarities of these two scripts. They make hardly any discrimination between ञ and ङ; and थ and ध. Anu-svāra and repha often take the place of a double consonant. These peculiarities do not present much difficulty to the editor of a work in Sanskrit, but to the editor of a Prakrit work on the subject of Grammar, they create untold difficulties and confusion in his work.

One very interesting point about T<sub>1</sub> and T<sub>2</sub> should be specially noted here. After folio 138 in T<sub>1</sub> and 180 in T<sub>2</sub> a portion beginning with °अहरो वार्धिः (our Text on page ३२९, (६२५) मणिगाअहरो वार्धिः) upto सराहो निद्रा° (our text on page ३३०, (६७४) दर्पोद्धुरः। सराहो (६७५) निद्रालुः) which constituted the contents of a folio, seems to be added, though it was out of place there. It seems to have come there because both T<sub>1</sub> and T<sub>2</sub> were copies of an older Ms. with a misplaced folio, and the copyist blindly copied the portion at a wrong place in T<sub>1</sub> and T<sub>2</sub>, and naturally missing in its proper place. As this very portion is missing in the Banaras edition, it appears that editors or the late Dr. T. K. Laddu had based his text on these manuscripts !

The original Manuscripts used for this edition are :

K—This is a palm-leaf manuscript, measuring 14.5 × 1.7 inches. It belongs to the collection of Śrī Lakṣmīśena Bhaṭṭāraka Maṭha, Kolhapur. The label on the board is Prākṛta Vyākaraṇa in the first line in black ink and Tri-vikrama-Kavi in the second line in red and black ink in Devanāgarī script; and bears No. 202. On the other board at the end we have Prākṛta Vyākaraṇa in Kannaḍa script. It is a well-preserved manuscript, but its appearance is not very old. It may be about 200 years old. It has 123 folios, 123b being blank. On one of the blank leaves of this manuscript, we find the following stanzas on the use of Prakrit dialects, taken apparently from the Ṣaḍbhāṣācandrikā (Cf. BSS edition, page 4, lines 4-8) :

अथेदानीं भाषाणां स्वरूपं विनियोगश्च कथ्यते—

भाषा द्विधा संस्कृता च प्राकृता चेति भेदतः ।

कौमारपाणिनीयादिसंस्कृता संस्कृता भवेत् ॥

इयं तु देवतादीनां मुनीनां नायकस्य च ।

विप्रक्षत्रियविदूशदमन्त्रिकञ्चुकिनामपि ॥ etc.

The entire manuscript is written in old Kannaḍa characters. The hand-writing is uniform, and the manuscript carefully written throughout. Here and there some corrections are made in a different hand in-between the lines and also on the margin. The writing is of that usual mode—scratching with stylus and then rubbing with black soot. The written portion on a page shows three divisions, with marginal blank space on both the sides and blank space surrounding the two string-holes in-between. Each page contains six to seven lines, and each line about sixty letters. In this script, it may be noted, *i* and *ī*, accompanying consonants, are not distinguished; for instances, *Vira* and *Vīra* are similarly represented. For the nasal conjuncts, anusvāra is used and not *parasavarna*. The fat zero indicates that the following consonant is to be doubled. There is no special sign for *anāsika*, anusvāra serving the purpose of both. The manuscript opens thus :

श्रीमत्पंचगुरुरभ्यो नमः ॥ सरस्वत्यै नमः ॥ निर्विघ्नमस्तु ॥ श्रीवीरप्राच्याचल°  
etc.

The colophon of the first pāda of the first adhyāya reads thus :

इति श्रीमदहं(शं)नंदित्रैविद्यश्रुतधर[ मुनिचंद्र ]श्रीपादप्रसादासादितसमस्त-  
विद्याप्रभावश्रीविक्रमदेवविरचितप्राकृतव्याकरणवृत्तौ प्रथ(स्थ)मस्याध्यायस्य प्रथमः  
पादः ॥

श्रीविक्रम in the above colophon is obviously a slip for *Tri-  
vikrama*. The letters put in round brackets are first written and then struck off, and the word *Municandra* in square brackets is added above the line in a different hand. The concluding portion runs thus :

इति श्रीमदर्हन्निदित्रैविद्यदेवश्रुतधरश्रीपादप्रसादासादितसमस्तविद्याप्रभावश्री-  
मत्त्रिविक्रमदेवविरचितप्राकृतव्याकरणवृत्तौ तृतीयस्याध्यायस्य चतुर्थः पादः ॥ समा-  
सश्च तृतीयोऽध्यायः । संपूर्णं चेदं प्राकृतव्याकरणं ॥ सप्रत्यय<sup>०</sup> etc.; विशदन्तः etc.;  
वक्ताः सन्तु etc. प्राकृतव्याकरणं संपूर्णं ॥ श्रीजिनाय नमः । शुभमस्तु । भद्र-  
मस्तु लेखकपाठकयोः ॥

Then in a different hand—

अपकर्तय्यपि संतः शुभानि कर्माणि कर्तुमीहन्ते ।

धिवत्तं सदोषकर्तरि ना यो (नरि ?) योजयत्यशुभं ॥

This verse on the palm-leaf is not covered with black soot.

S—This manuscript was procured for me by Dr. A. N. Upadhye from Sholapur. It is a modern paper manuscript, and probably prepared from K described above, as the missing portions, mistakes etc. are identical in both, though this manuscript has added a number of its own. It has got 112 folios,  $12\frac{1}{2} \times 6\frac{1}{2}$  inches with 11 lines to a page and about 38 letters to a line. After the last stanza, i.e. वक्ताः सन्तु etc., the manuscript ends thus :

प्राकृतव्याकरणं संपूर्णं । शुभमस्तु । भद्रमस्तु लेखकपाठकयोः । स्वस्ति श्रीम-  
सुरासुरवृन्दं दितपादपाथोजश्रीमन्नेमीश्वरसमुत्पत्तिपवित्रीकृतगौतमगोत्रार्हतद्विजश्री-  
मद्ब्रह्मसूरिशशिखितनूजश्रीमद्दोर्बलिजिनदासशास्त्रिणामन्तेवासिना विजयचंद्राभिदे(धे)न  
जैनशत्रियेणालेखीति ॥ ॐ शान्तिः ॥ प्रभवनामसंवत्सरे फाल्गुणमासे प्रथमदिवसे  
सौम्यवासरे संपूर्णमाहुः ॥ ग्रंथसंख्या ३५००.

I understand that दोर्बलिजिनदासशास्त्रिन् mentioned in the colophon above died some 25 years back, and his pupil विजयचंद्र is still living at Śravaṇa Belgol. The manuscript thus is not more than 50–60 years old.

#### CONSTITUTION OF PRAKRIT TEXTS

The work of editing a text in Prakrit requires adoption of certain methods which are considerably different from those applicable to texts in the Sanskrit language. Many individual attempts have been made by conscientious editors to enunciate the principles of textual criticism as applicable to Prakrit texts, but they are only partially successful. I am making one

more such attempt, having considerable experience of editing Prakrit works, and remembering the difficulties I have experienced. These difficulties can be classified as under (i) Want of reliable Manuscripts; (ii) Variety of Prakrit Dialects characteristics of which are not easy to determine (iii) Conflicting directions and statements of Prakrit Grammarians divided into different schools. Under the circumstances, it is not easy to evolve a set of principles which could be universally applicable. Individual editors are thus left to their own whims and vagaries, and to the principle of eclectics. It may be said that time has not yet come to fix up the principles of textual criticism as applicable to Prakrit works. My attempt here is to clarify the situation, and suggest methods with a view that they may be of some use to future editors.

(1) *Dearth of Reliable Manuscripts*:—It is not now possible to catch hold of author's autograph copies of works in Prakrit. Copies of Prakrit works, found in libraries and private collections, are far removed from their original. The scripts in which manuscripts of Prakrit works are found, are usually limited to one or two only. I know the existence of a Śāradā manuscript of Śākuntalā where Prakrit passages are found; I also know of manuscripts of Ānandavardhana's Dhvanyāloka in that script containing stanzas in Prakrit; I know also manuscripts in Bengali script of some Sanskrit dramas containing Prakrit passages; there are similar manuscripts in Telugu or old Kannaḍa, in Tamil and Malayālam; but it is rarely that a large number of manuscripts in different scripts is ever used for the editing of a Prakrit work.

Copies of manuscripts of every successive degree are usually considerably spoiled by copyists. If they happen to be illiterate, they make an attempt to reproduce letters of the original manuscript without understanding the meaning of the text which is beyond their comprehension. If they happen to be literate and versed in Sanskrit, they are likely to be faithful in making the copy, but their prejudices are responsible for considerable Sanskritisation of the Prakrit text, and also for bringing the Prakrit text in line with Sanskrit. Take the case of Śūdraka's Mṛcchakatika, a drama which abounds in Prakrit

passages in a variety of dialects. We now hardly have three or four genuine manuscripts of this play in the libraries of the world. There are many Prakrit works available only in a single manuscript. The question which troubles a conscientious editor, therefore, is, whether we should faithfully reproduce the manuscript, and pass it on as the correct form as understood by, or as current in the age of, the author; or, we should use our knowledge of comparative grammar and textual criticism to modify it and bring it into line with modern trends. The question, in my opinion, should be solved on the principle of eclectics, as I shall show presently.

(2) *The variety of Prakrit Dialects and want of uniformity in their names*:—The oldest grammarian of Prakrit dialects is Vararuci. No doubt we have some information on the subject available in Bharata's Nāṭyaśāstra (XVII 7–23; 59–63) which we are giving in the seventh appendix to the present volume, but it is extremely scanty. The names which Bharata uses for Prakrit dialects seem to be discarded by Hemacandra and Trivikrama. Vararuci, thus, is the oldest grammarian of the Prakrit dialects; and has obviously influenced the subsequent grammarians of both the schools noted below. He, according to the existing text-tradition, treats of four dialects, Māhārāṣṭrī, Māgadhī, Paisācī and Śaurasenī. Some of his commentators have commented on the first eight or nine adhyāyas of his work dealing with principal Prakrit, and ignored the remaining adhyāyas. Mārkaṇḍeya mentions a still larger number of Prakrit dialects and seems to follow Bharata to some extent. Sir George Grierson says that, like Vararuci, Mārkaṇḍeya belongs to the Eastern school of Prakrit Grammarians. Puruṣottama and Rāmaśarman Tarkavāgiśa belong to this school.

Caṇḍa, Hemacandra, Trivikrama and Śrutsāgara belong to a school which is different from the above school, and according to Grierson, constitutes the Western school of Prakrit Grammarians. They classify the Prakrit dialects as Prākṛata, (corresponding to Māhārāṣṭrī), Śaurasenī, Māgadhī, Paisācī, Cūlikāpaisācī and Apabhraṃśa. Hemacandra mentions Ārṣa Prākṛta, meaning thereby Ardhamāgadhī or language of the

Jaina canon. Although all these grammarians have modelled their grammars on Pāṇini, they were unable to ignore the variety of forms available in the Prakrit language, and hence unable to fix the form of the language or dialect as Pāṇini has done. There is no work of the type of Prātiśākhya for the Prakrit languages, with the result that phonetic values of sounds in Prakrit remained fluid, one using प, ड, ञ, and another using फ, ढ, झ for the same sound. Besides, almost all grammarians state that the rules framed by them are applicable *generally*, and characteristics of one dialect may be noticeable in another dialect. This principle has added to the chaos, initiated by scribes of manuscripts.

(3) *Conflicting Directions and Statements of Prakrit Grammarians about the Characteristics of Dialects*, associated with the two types mentioned above, are equally responsible for the chaos noticeable in manuscripts, and modern editions. I give below a list of such rules picked up from Hemacandra and Trivikrama for the present. If I bring in the rules of Vararuci, Mārkaṇḍeya, Puruṣottama and Ramaśarman Tarkavāgīśa *vis-a-vis* with their rules, one will easily see that the characteristics of Prakrit dialects had either undergone changes as time advanced, or the grammarians were not themselves quite sure about rules they have framed, or the strata of literature analysed by them was not necessarily identical. I give below a list of principal rules from Trivikrama and Hemacandra to illustrate my point of view :

(1) The word प्रायः, generally, occurring in a number of sūtras, e.g., 1.3.1.; 1.1.14; 1.3.8; 3.2.63 in Trivikrama and in several sūtras of Hemacandra. This word allows a lack of rigidity in their application.

(2) The sūtra बहुलम् occurring in both Trivikrama and Hemacandra, which means कचिप्रवृत्तिः कचिदप्रवृत्तिः कचिद्विभाषा कचिदन्यदेव, and Hemacandra's statement अपरे तु सर्वे विधयो विकल्प्यन्ते.

(3) The word कचित् and वा, explicitly and implicitly, occurring in a large number of sūtras, in both Trivikrama and Hemacandra.

(4) In compound words the initial letter of the second member is allowed certain changes under the principle वाक्य-विभक्त्यपेक्षया अन्त्यत्वमनन्त्यत्वं च.

(5) The principle of श्रुतिसुख as against अर्थसुख.

(6) The sūtras नो णः and आदेस्तु or वादौ, occurring in Hemacandra and Trivikrama which allow retension of initial न against the compulsory change of न to ण recommended by grammarians of the Eastern School.

(7) Application of the rule regarding यश्रुति as in 1.3.10 in Trivikrama and in i. 180 in Hemacandra.

(8) Optional doubling of consonants after ए and ओ.

(9) Shortening of ए and ओ when followed by a conjunct to इ and उ, giving us एक, एक, इक.

(10) Substitution of one vowel for another under the sūtra अचोऽचाम् in 2.4.71 in Trivikrama's Grammar.

In the case of Apabhramśa, in addition to options mentioned above, the following rules create chaos:—

- (1) प्रायोऽपभ्रंशोऽचोऽच् 3.3.1
- (2) होः स्तोस्त्वारलाघवम् 3.4.64
- (3) हल्स्थैः 3.4.66
- (4) बिन्दोरन्ते 3.4.65
- (5) तद्व्यत्ययश्च 3.4.69

It is no wonder therefore that a variety of forms, which in no way change the meaning of the term are found in manuscripts.

In addition, want of a special sign for the अनुनासिक and for short forms of ए and ओ, have created confusion in manuscripts.

Further, scribes and the methods they adopt in preparing manuscripts are responsible for a lot of confusion. These peculiarities of scribes are classified as under :

(1) Something like the mark of अनुस्वार used to indicate the doubling of the following consonant.

(2) Non-doubling of consonants erratically.

(3) Confusion in the following pairs of letters :

ए and इ; ओ and उ; ओ and वो; ड and ढ; ज and झ; ब and व;  
थ and ध; म and ह; र and ल; प and व; प and य; ल and ळ; च and छ;  
स्थ and ञ्.

(4) Incorrect application of the rule पूर्वमुपरि वर्गस्य युजः,  
1.4.94.

(5) Aspiration of certain letters which gives ड for ढ;  
प for फ; ज for झ promiscuously.

(6) Copies prepared from dictation.

The case of the treatment of न in Prakrit and its dialects is a point on which further discussion is necessary. The following note would be found useful by the reader :

न and ण in Prakrit :—According to Bharata न initial, medial and conjunct in Sanskrit words is changed to ण except in some local dialects (e.g., Paisācī). This rule seems to be observed by all non-Jaina writers and also by some Jaina writers. But Hemacandra and Trivikrama, both of whom are Jains, and their followers like Śrutasāgara, have laid down that initial न in Sanskrit words may be optionally changed to ण, while medial न, single and double, should be invariably changed to ण. Further, Hemacandra holds that there cannot be न, either initial or medial, in Deśī words. In his Deśīnāmamālā, page 208, BSS edition, he states :

नकारादयस्तु [शब्दाः] देश्यात्मसंभविन एवेति न निबद्धाः । यच्च “ वादौ ”  
(१.२२९) इति सूत्रितमस्माभिः, तत्संस्कृतमवप्राकृतशब्दापेक्षया न देश्य-  
पेक्षयेति सर्वमवदातम् ।

Hemacandra's view stated in the above passage, is that a Deśī word with initial न is impossible or does not exist; that his sūtra वादौ (i.229) refers only to such Prakrit words as are derived from Sanskrit, and hence it does not refer to Deśī words at all.

Trivikrama, on the other hand, does not seem to accept the above view of Hemacandra. Under 2.4.127 Trivikrama gives निरप्पइ as a धात्वादेश or Deśī root, but adds णत्वे निरप्पइ, which latter form indicates that he believed that initial न might

occur even in Deśi words. Words like आरनाल, अनिल, अनल etc., having medial न, are known to exist in early Prakrit works, say, in the Ardhmāgadhī or Ārṣa dialect, and accepted as such by Hemacandra. They may be regarded as borrowed either from Sanskrit or from local dialects having the influence of Paisāci.

It will be seen from the above discussion that Prakrit grammarians of the so-called Western School are not unanimous with regard to the change of न to ण. This has resulted in a state of chaos and confusion in MSS., and also in modern editions. I would suggest the following course in this respect. If the Prakrit work to be edited is a Jaina work, keep initial न if the word can be traced to Sanskrit, and change medial न to ण. Monosyllabic words like ण for ननु should be regarded as Deśi words, but नून for नूनम् may have initial न. In the case of non-Jaina Prakrit works, have ण for न everywhere. Jacobi seems to have framed a rule of his own with reference to न occurring medially, that it should be न if the Sanskrit word does not contain ण, but should be ण if the original Sanskrit has ण. For instance दिन्न from दत्त should retain the dental न; कन्या should be कन्या; but कर्ण should give us कण्ण. Grammarians do not give their support to Jacobi's view. Manuscripts also do not support the above view, and hence I have now come to the conclusion stated above. When this rule is followed, the vagaries of MSS. may be ignored.

These are in brief the difficulties which the editor of a work written in Prakrits is required to face. The causes noted above, and the list of vagaries in manuscripts and scribes look formidable; but he has to evolve a system out of this chaos. The following principles may guide him to some extent in this respect :

(1) Make an effort first to determine whether the work in Prakrit or its dialects belongs to the Jaina or non-Jaina school of thought. It is quite possible that non-Jaina works preserved in Jaina Bhoṇḍāras may present certain difficulties.

(2) Make an effort to determine the dialect or dialects used in the work. When the dialect in which the work or

passage is written is determined, proceed to see that the text you adopt conforms to the standard rules of the dialect found in a system of grammar.

(3) If the work in Prakrits comes from a Jaina source, the text should conform to the rules of Hemacandra and Trivikrama.

(4) If the Prakrit work comes from a non-Jaina source, the text should conform to the rules given by Vararuci, Puruṣottama, Mārkaṇḍeya or Rāmaśarman Tarkavāgiśa.

(5) The following categories of manuscript vagaries should be ignored while recording variants : न and ण; अनुस्वार and अनुनासिक; short ए and इ and ओ and उ; incorrect application of पूर्वमुपरि वर्गस्य युजः; अनुस्वार used to indicate doubling of the following consonant; and letters obtained merely by aspiration.

These are my ideas for the guidance of future editors of Prakrit works. It does not mean that I have followed them in editing the present text, because I want to know the reaction of scholars engaged in editing such texts to the above set of principles.

There are still some ticklish points which deserve elucidation here. The rule बहुलम् in both Hemacandra and Trivikrama has to be used with caution. The old school of grammarians did not regard this rule as creating chaos; they rather held that it should be interpreted as to yield the doctrine of व्यवस्थितविभाषा. The modern editor should follow this principle of व्यवस्थितविभाषा, and evolve certain principles based on eclectics. I give here a few specific illustrations of the application of the above doctrine.

The grammarians allow for Sanskrit खलु two forms in Prakrit, viz., खु and हु. Manuscripts are found to use them promiscuously; but the modern editor should see that हु should not be used, though found in his manuscripts, *after* an anu-svāra. For, Trivikrama says, under 3.1.54, बहुलाधिकारादनुस्वारात्परो हु न प्रयोक्तव्यः. Thus, एवं खलु in Sanskrit should be एवं खु and not एवं हु.

Similarly, we have for Sanskrit अपि several forms in Prakrit, such as पि, वि, मि, अवि. We should have in Prakrit किं पि, किमवि and even किं मि and तह वि; but should not allow किं वि. Note in this connection अपेर्विः पदान्ते and अनुस्वारात् पिः as found in Puruṣottama's Prakṛtānuśāsana, IV. 3-4. The same principle should govern our choice for substitutes of इव such इव, पिव, विव, मिव, व, व्व. Of these पिव and मिव can be used after an anusvāra; but विव and व should not be; व्व can be used only after a short vowel.

The general tendency of the Prakrit languages is not to allow a conjunct consonant at the beginning of a word. ख्येव or ख्येव्व seems to be not quite good, but if the ending vowel of the preceding word happens to be ए or ओ, we may allow the double consonant. Thus, we have सो ख्येव or सो ख्येव्व; सो च्चिअ, ते च्चेअ. The variants of such words in manuscripts may be ignored as they do not change the sense of the expression in any way. Or, if an editor wants to swell his critical apparatus, he may note all manuscript variants fixing his text according to principles stated above.

#### SŪTRAS ON PRAKRIT GRAMMAR EARLIER THAN HEMACANDRA AND TRIVIKRAMA

The following passages are found in Hemacandra's Grammar : अत्र केचिद् ऋत्वादिषु ( तस्य ) दः इत्यारब्धवन्तः, स तु शौरसेनी-मागधीविषय एव दृश्यते इति नोच्यते, under रुदिते दिना णः 1.209; and केचित्तु केवलानन्तर्यार्थयोर्णवरणवरि इत्येकमेव सूत्रं कुर्वते, तन्मते उभावप्युभयार्थौ under आनन्तर्ये णवरि 2.188. The first of these is reproduced by Trivikrama under णदिना रुदिते 1.3.49 in identical terms, and the second under आनन्तर्ये णवरिअ 2.1.46 with a slight change, आहुः for कुर्वते. These quotations raise an important issue as to what works in the sūtra style Hemacandra had before him. On examination I find ऋत्वादिषु तो दः in Vararuci, 2.7. I was not able to trace the second either in Vararuci or in Puruṣottama, both of whom give separate sūtras for णवर and णवरि. In my opinion the references do not indicate the existence of Vālmīkisūtras, because Hemacandra and Trivikrama cannot refer to a sage of high antiquity by the slightful term केचित्. Neither the sūtras in Hemacandra can be ascribed to Vālmīki

because Hemacandra calls them his own, nor does Trivikrama state anywhere that the sūtras belong to Vālmiki and Vṛtti alone is composed by him. On the contrary, Trivikrama, in the introductory stanza 9, says that the sūtras are his own composition (निजसूत्र) and that he writes a commentary to help those who want to understand the correct meaning of the sūtras. I feel further that the sūtras in Hemacandra are his own as also in Trivikrama. None of them, at any rate Hemacandra, can be accused of plagiarism of the so-called Vālmiki-sūtras.

Chronologically, the first reference to Vālmikisūtra is found in the following passage from a work *Śambhurahasya* (the genuineness of which is yet to be proved):

को विनिन्देदिमां भाषां भारतीमुग्धभाषिताम् ।  
 यस्याः प्रचेतसः पुत्रो व्याकर्ता भगवानुपिः ॥ २६७ ॥ १३  
 गार्ग्यगालवशाकल्यपाणिन्याद्या यथर्षयः ।  
 शब्दराशेः संस्कृतस्य व्याकर्तारो महत्तमाः ॥ १४ ॥  
 तथैव प्राकृतादीनां षड्भाषाणां महामुनिः ।  
 आदिकाव्यकृदाचार्यो व्याकर्ता लोकविश्रुतः ॥ १५ ॥  
 यथैव रामचरितं संस्कृतं तेन निर्मितम् ।  
 तथैव प्राकृतेनापि निर्मितं हि सतां मुदे ॥ १६ ॥  
 पाणिन्यादैः शिक्षितत्वात्संस्कृती श्राव्योत्तमा ।  
 प्राचेतसव्याकृतत्वात्प्राकृत्यपि तथोत्तमा ॥ १७ ॥  
 प्राकृतं चार्पमेवेदं यद्धि वाल्मीकिशिक्षितम् ।  
 तदुनापि भवे(वदे?)द्यो वै प्राकृतः स्यात्स एव हि ॥ १८ ॥

The above passage, first cited by K. P. Trivedi in his Introduction (page 13) to *Ṣaḍbhāṣācandrikā* has been repeated in *Mallikāmārutam* as from *Śambhurahasya* from the Vani Vilas Press, Srirangam. The work *Śambhurahasya*, from its contents and language, cannot claim a very high antiquity, and may have grown from time to time like the Purāṇas. In my opinion, it may belong to 14th century or later. Based on this passage, perhaps, Lakṣmīdhara wrote in his *Ṣaḍbhāṣācandrikā*:

वाग्देवी जननी येषां वाल्मीकिर्मूलसूत्रकृत् ।  
 भाषाप्रयोगास्ते ज्ञेयाः षड्भाषाचन्द्रिकाध्वना ॥ १५ ॥

There is a manuscript, No. 1548, in the Government Mss. Library in Madras, called *Vālmikisūtram*. The scribe Deśikācārya seems to have added the following stanzas at the beginning of this Ms. :—

येन श्रीरामचरितमधिगम्य सुरर्षितः ।  
 श्रीमद्रामायणं प्रोक्तं तस्मै वाल्मीकये नमः ॥ १ ॥  
 येन निर्मलिता ना(गा)वः षड्भाषाकृतयो नृणाम् ।  
 विमलः सुक्तकतकस्तस्मै वाल्मीकये नमः ॥ २ ॥  
 स्वान्तस्थ काव्येन गिरां च षण्णां  
 सूत्रैर्नराणां कलुषं प्रपस्या ।  
 पराकरोद्यः प्रथमः कवीनां  
 वाल्मीकिमेनं मुनिमानतोऽस्मि ॥ ३ ॥

These stanzas seems to be the composition of the scribe Deśikācārya who prepared the manuscript on 20th October 1883 (see Dr. Upadhye's article : *Vālmikisūtra* : A myth, in *Bhāratiya Vidyā*, Vol. II. ii. pp. 160-176). Of the three verses the first two are an imitation of the first two stanzas of Pāṇiniya Śikṣā, and the third an imitation of

योगेन चित्तस्य पदेन वाचां मलं शरीरस्य च वैद्यकेन ।  
 योऽपाकरोत्तं प्रवरं मुनीनां पतञ्जलिं प्राञ्जलिरानतोऽस्मि ॥

and as such we should not attach any value to them.

Coming to Lakṣamīdhara's successor, Appaya Dikṣita, we find the following stanzas in his *Prākṛta-Maṇi-Dīpa* (Mysore, Oriental Research Institute, Publication No. 92):

ये त्रिविक्रमदेवेन हेमचन्द्रेण चेरिताः ।  
 लक्ष्मीधरेण च ग्रन्था भोजेन च महीक्षिता ॥ ४ ॥  
 ये पुष्पवननाथेन ये वा वाररुचा अपि ।  
 वार्तिकार्णवभाष्याद्या अप्ययज्वकृताश्च ये ॥ ५ ॥  
 ते विस्तृतवाप्रायेण संक्षेपरुचिभिजनः ।  
 अगृहीता विलम्बन्ते संध्यार्ककिरणा इव ॥ ६ ॥  
 अतः प्राकृतशब्दानामन्धे तमसि मज्जताम् ।  
 प्रकाशनाय क्रियते संक्षिप्ता मणिदीपिका ॥ ७ ॥

It should be noted that Appaya Dikṣita has mentioned by name Trivikrama, Hemacandra, Bhoja and Vararuci along with

Lakṣmīdhara and Puṣpavanānātha (who to me appears to be no other than Vasantarāja, the author of a commentary on Vararuci), but did not think worth his while to mention Vālmīki, perhaps he did not believe that the sūtras on which Trivikrama wrote a commentary, were composed by Vālmīki.

The passage from *Śambhurahasya* quoted above is the first indication or source of the myth that Vālmīki, the author of the Rāmāyaṇa composed the sūtras on Prakrit Grammar. As the sūtras of Trivikrama are based on those of Hemacandra, many of them identical and almost all of them giving the same substance, we have to suppose that even Hemacandra must have used the sūtras of Vālmīki; but Hemacandra calls his work of sūtras as स्वोपज्ञवृत्तिसहितम्. Trivikrama also says निजसूत्रमार्गमनुजिगमिषताम्. The myth therefore of ascribing the sūtras of Trivikrama to Vālmīki must have come into vogue later than the age of Trivikrama, and the passage from *Śambhurahasya* quoted above must also belong to that period. If *Śambhurahasya* passage belongs to 14th century A.D., Lakṣmīdhara (1541-1565 A.D.) can well say वाल्मीकिमूलसूत्रकृत्. I am prepared to confess that Lakṣmīdhara may not have started the canard, but, it must be said, the popularity of his work gave currency to the myth. The relative chronology of Hemacandra (1172 A.D.), Trivikrama (1236-1300 A.D.), Sinharāja (1300-1400 A.D.), Lakṣmīdhara (1541-1565 A.D.) and Appaya Dīkṣita (1554-1626 A.D.) should be noted in this connection. The champions of the theory that Vālmīki is the author of the sūtras on which Trivikrama wrote the commentary among modern scholars are Hultsch, K. P. Trivedi, Nitti-Dolci and editor of the Prakṛta-Maṇi-Dīpa; Pischel gave up the theory during his life-time as the late Dr. T. K. Laddu states in his paper on Trivikrama. Bhaṭṭanāthaswamin and Laddu held that Trivikrama was the author of both sūtras and vṛtti. Dr. A. N. Upadhye has discussed the point fully and has shown how worthless the theory is.

#### THE SŪTRAPĀṬHA OF TRIVIKRAMA

Trivikrama's Prakṛta-Śabdānuśāsana, as presented in this edition contains 1036 sūtras. The sūtrapāṭha as given in the appendix to Śaḍbhāṣācandrikā by K. P. Trivedi, contains the

same number of sūtras with निम्माणं निम्मिअं between 1.2.46 and 1.2.48 which I have omitted, and dropping सप्तम्याश्च 3.4.53 which I have added. The text of the sūtras given in *Prākṛta-Maṇi-Dīpa* has the same number of sūtras. It also omits निम्माणं निम्मिअं of Trivedi, and adds सप्तम्याश्च as I have done. The छन्दःछायापत्रः सूत्रपाठः published by Bhaṭṭanāthaswamin omits सप्तम्याश्च.

Of these 1036 sūtras of Trivikrama, Simharāja in his *Prākṛta-Rūpāvatāra* has commented on 575 sūtras and Lakṣmīdhara in his *Ṣaḍbhāṣācandrikā* on 994 sūtras, the latter thus ignoring some 42 sūtras. These 1036 sūtras of Trivikrama are divided into three adhyāyas, each adhyāya being again divided into four pādas. Trivikrama at one place proudly refers to his work on Prakrit Grammar as द्वादशपदी (on page 306 under 3.4.71) on the analogy of द्वादशाध्यायी system of Pūrvamīmāṃsā. The Prakrit portion of *Siddha-Hema-Śabdānuśāsana* has only one adhyāya divided into four pādas and contains 1119 sūtras.

#### COMPARISON OF THE SŪTRAPĀTHA OF TRIVIKRAMA AND HEMACANDRA

Trivikrama's Sūtrapāṭha contains 1036 sūtras divided into twelve pādas and three adhyāyas, as against 1119 in four pādas of the eighth adhyāya of Hemacandra's *Siddha-Hema-Śabdānuśāsana* (i-271; ii-218; iii-182 and iv-448). The subject-matter covered by both is almost the same. Trivikrama has newly added the following sūtras : 1.1.1-16; 1.1.38; 1.1.45; 1.2.109 (पुञ्जाद्याद्याः); 1.3.14; 1.3.77; 1.3.100; 1.3.105 (गोणाद्याः); 1.4.83; 1.4.85; 1.4.107; 1.4.120; 1.4.121 (गहिआद्याः); 2.1.30 (वरङ्गताः); 2.2.9; 3.1.129; 3.4.65-67 and 3.4.72 (झाङ्गाः); in all 32. Of these, 17 sūtras relate to new technical terms used by Trivikrama; four sūtras relate to the groups of Deśī words for which Hemacandra has only one sūtra in his Grammar and an entire work, the *Deśināmamālā*; and the remaining sūtras add a few new words not treated by Hemacandra. Thus the subject-matter of 1119 sūtras of Hemacandra has been compressed by Trivikrama in about 1000 sūtras. This he was able to do by compressing two or more

sūtras in one. There are about 100 sūtras which have identical wording in both Hemacandra and Trivikrama; while there are a few in which Trivikrama has only changed the order of words or Ādeśas given by Hemacandra.

Hemacandra wrote his Prakrit Grammar as a continuation of his Sanskrit Grammar. The treatment of Sanskrit grammar covered seven adhyāyas, the eighth, the last, being devoted to Prakrits. He therefore had to continue the same scheme of adhyāya, pāda, sūtra, anuvṛtti and technical terms used in the first seven adhyāyas for the eighth adhyāya also. His division of the subject of Prakrit Grammar into four pādas is somewhat better or more systematic than the division adopted by Trivikrama. Hemacandra's first pāda (271 sūtras) deals with some preliminaries and treatment of vowels and single consonants; second pāda (218 sūtras) deals with the treatment of conjunct consonants (1-124); Prakrit substitutes for some Sanskrit words (125-144); some suffixes (145-173); the nipātas or Deśī words (174); and indeclinables (175-218); the third pāda deals with rules of declension (2-129); rules of syntax (130-137); conjugation and participles (138-182); and the fourth pāda gives the Dhātvādeśas (1-259); and dialects—Śauraseni (260-286); Māgadhi (287-302); Paisāci (303-324); Cūlikāpaisāci (325-328) and Apabhraṃśa (329-448). Barring the huddling up the Dhātvādeśas and dialects into one pāda, we do not find anything faulty in Hemacandra's method of treatment. The case with Trivikrama, on the other hand, is different. He wrote his grammar of principal Prakrit and its dialects only. He had to frame his own terminology (1.1.1-16). He has divided his work into three adhyāyas, each adhyāya having four pādas. It was expected of him to arrange the subject-matter more systematically. It must be said, however, that the expectation is not fulfilled. The invention of technical terms like ह, दि, स, ग etc., is not very happy. At any rate the introduction of these terms has made his sūtras less clear than those of Hemacandra. The rest of his work covers the same field as Hemacandra's work. Hemacandra refers to Deśī words under one sūtra only, viz., गोणादयः while Trivikrama has six sūtras for the same topic. It must go to the

credit of Trivikrama to have classified the Deśī words into six groups. His treatment of syntax is scanty, and he unnecessarily splits up the Dhātuvādesas into two pādas in two different adhyāyas, without much reason. Again Hemacandra arranges the Ādesas according to the initial letter of the Sanskrit root, e.g., कथ्, गम्, etc. Trivikrama does not seem to have followed any system in arranging his roots. Among the list of Deśī words, we find a few which are not traceable to Deśināmamālā. Such words may be regarded as Trivikrama's contribution. In the section on Apabhramśa he has copied *all* the illustrations from Hemacandra, and has added nothing new excepting perhaps the Sanskrit Chāyā, but omitted several illustrations given by Hemacandra.

Trivikrama wanted to score a point over Hemacandra first by reducing the number of sūtras; reducing the volume of the text by introducing shorter terms like ह् for ह्रस्व; दि for दीर्घ; स for समास and ग for गण; and bringing all the Deśī words into the fold of grammar for which Hemacandra had to write a special book, the Deśināmamālā. All this seems to have been done under the influence of the doctrine : अर्धमात्रालाघवेन पुत्रोऽसर्वं मन्यन्ते वैयाकरणाः; but he seems to be unaware of the fact that a saṃjñā or technical term has the same value of a mātrā or half a mātrā, irrespective of the number of syllables it contains. So दि and दीर्घ, स and समास have the same metrical value, as सर्वनामस्थान, आर्धधातुक etc. For all practical purposes, thus, the volume of Trivikrama's grammar is the same as that of Hemacandra. The clarity which Hemacandra's work has, is considerably impaired in Trivikrama's work.

#### COMPARISON OF TRIVIKRAMA AND LAKṢMĪDHARA

The interval between the age of Trivikrama and Lakṣmīdhara seems to be about two hundred years or so. This period created some new myths. One of them was that the sūtras on which Trivikrama wrote his commentary, were not his sūtras, but those of Vālmiki, the author of the Rāmāyaṇa; and the second was that Trivikrama's commentary was very difficult and required some elucidation. I do not subscribe to the views of Lakṣmīdhara on both the points. I know the

expression निजसूत्रमार्गमनुजिगमिषताम् is capable of being construed in two ways : (i) निजानां स्वीयानां सूत्राणां मार्गः अर्थः, (ii) निजः स्वामाविकः सूत्रार्थः, the first construing निज with सूत्र and the second with सूत्रार्थ. Hultzsich suggested the latter sense, saying that it was natural with South Indians. Bhattanāṭ swāmin has shown that Hultzsich was wrong, and yet the edition of Appaya Dikṣita's Prākṛta-Maṇi-Dīpa supports it. It is in the latter sense that gave rise to the myth that Vālmīki was the author of the sūtras. I have already discussed the question above and need not repeat my views here. Next, Lakṣmīdhara held the view that the text of Trivikrama's Vṛtti was difficult and pregnant with sense :—

वृत्तिं त्रैविक्रमीं गूढां व्याचिख्यासन्ति ये बुधाः ।

षड्भाषाचन्द्रिका तैस्तद्व्याख्यारूपा विलोक्यताम् ॥ १६ ॥

The above statement of Lakṣmīdhara may be all right if its purpose is to justify his work. I however do not find Trivikrama's work difficult; Lakṣmīdhara's so-called supplementary commentary, on the other hand, is more difficult. For instance, compare Lakṣmīdhara on pages 16-17 under 1.1.3 and page 91 under 2.3.31, and page 259 under 3.2.47, where his text is more difficult, and rendered so intentionally to show off his knowledge of Pūrvamīmāṃsā. In another case, while giving the senses of Deśī words, pages 163-184, he did not correctly understand Trivikrama and his methodology, and has assigned wrong senses, which are not supported by Deśināmamālā, which for this purpose is more authentic than even Trivikrama. It may be that by the time Lakṣmīdhara wrote his *Ṣaḍbhāṣācandrikā*, the text of Trivikrama had already become corrupted but it appears quite clear that he wrongly read Trivikrama's Vṛtti, and did not use Hemacandra's great work on Deśī words, which would have given him correct lead in case of doubt. Lakṣmīdhara's Vārtikas on अपुण्यगाः केन, 3.1.132, are a good illustration how he lacked the critical faculty. My view is that Lakṣmīdhara had no genuine acquaintance with Prakrit works, particularly, with literary works, and he wrote his work just to show his acquaintance with the Prakrit Grammar. Lakṣmīdhara, thus, cannot be considered to be a reliable guide to Trivikrama.

## PERSONAL HISTORY AND DATE OF TRIVIKRAMA

Like several writers of fame in Indian Literature, Trivikrama leaves but a scanty record about himself and about his date. He gives in the introductory and concluding stanzas of the present work some information, and it runs as follows : Trivikrama comes of a good family of Bāṇa. His grand-father was Ādityavarman. His parents are Mallinātha and Lakṣmī. He had a brother named Bhāma (variants : सोम, राम, वाम, चाम) known for his excellent behaviour and learning. Trivikrama seems to have studied under Arhanandi, a master of the sacred literature (of the Jainas), and a monk possessing three lores. Trivikrama calls himself to be a good poet (sukaviḥ), although no literary work of his has come down to us. The concluding verses of his grammar which however are not found in all the manuscripts (two Tanjore manuscripts do not give them, nor one of the two used for the Banaras edition), but can be surely considered to be his composition (मम in the second verse), state that people should mutter as a sacred mantra his Śabdā-nuśāsana, dealing with basic forms of words, suffixes, rules of syntax, verbal forms and deśya words, couched in short sūtras, and with an ample stock of illustrations, for the attainment of their objective. Those who appreciate works of art and the logicians will be pleased to read his poem (kāvyā, not necessarily the grammar), because the sweetness of words, entering inside, will fatten the ears; the newness of sense in every word, will please a man of good words; and the sentiment or aesthetic feeling will pervade the whole world as if on account of the greatness of the work. All persons are capable to express their own ideas; Trivikrama, however, is unique in (nicely) expressing his own ideas which faithfully represent his own views, and also in faithfully representing the ideas of others. It is a pity that no poetic work of Trivikrama has come down to us to verify the above statement.

As regards Trivikrama's religion, we can say definitely that he was a follower of Jainism, as is clear from his salutation to Vīra, i.e., Mahāvīra, in the opening verse. The references to Vīrasena and Jinasena in stanza 4 indicate, equally clearly,

his reverence to these ācāryas, and go to prove that Trivikrama was a follower of the Digambara sect of the Jainas; and his reference to Hemacandra in stanza 11 goes to suggest, that though a follower of Digambara sect, he could easily rise above the sectarian prejudices, which in those days were not as strong as they are to-day.

Hemacandra makes some distinction between Ārṣa (i.e., Ardha-Māgadhī of the Canon of the Śvetāmbara Jainas) and Prakrit (i.e., Māhārāṣṭrī or Principal Prakrit). Trivikrama also makes reference to Ārṣa in stanza 7; but he says that Ārṣa and Deśya are *rūḍha* forms of the language; they are quite independent; and hence, do not stand in need of grammar; tradition alone can give information on these forms. On the contrary, the Prakrit languages, the stock of words in which can be traced to siddha and sādhyamāna Sanskrit, can be subjected to rules of grammar; and it is this stock of words which is treated in Trivikrama's grammar. Trivikrama, quite modestly, says that he has picked up only a few words from the flood of ocean of the writings of Vīrasena and Jinasena. In stanza 9, he says he writes a commentary on his own sūtras in order that men should obtain mastery over the subject, and that his commentary follows the traditional methods (of Hemacandra?). Although, Trivikrama says, he has selected only a few words, they will work like a mirror, as such is the greatness of his commentary. The method followed in treating the Prakrit forms, is the traditional method adopted by ancient masters down to Ācārya Hemacandra.

As to Trivikrama's date, we have equally scanty information. He mentions Vīrasena and Jinasena of Dhavalā and Jayadhavalā fame who belonged to the middle of the 9th century of the Christian era. He mentions Hemacandra who died in A.D. 1172. Trivikrama, thus is later than the last quarter of the 12th century, but not much later than Hemacandra. Dr. Upadhye holds that he wrote his grammar soon after A.D. 1236.

Luckily for us, we have three works, Simharāja's *Prākṛta-Rūpāvatāra*, Lakṣmīdhara's *Ṣaḍbhāṣācandrikā*, and Appaya

Dikṣita's *Prākṛta-Maṇi-Dīpa*, which are later than Trivikrama. Of these, Appaya Dikṣita is the youngest, who died in A.D. 1626, and was a prolific writer. His work mentioned above cannot be his last work, but rather a work of his younger days. He died at the mature age of 72. Lakṣmīdhara is specifically mentioned in his work, who thus seems to have lived in the last quarter of the 15th century or the first quarter of the 16th century, say, between A.D. 1475 and 1525. Śimharāja is not mentioned either by Lakṣmīdhara or Appaya Dikṣita, but seems to be older or almost a senior contemporary, and may be assigned to the first half of the 15th century. All these indications prove that we can safely assign Trivikrama to the latter half of the 13th century.

We have no definite data to determine the province of the residence of Trivikrama. But his being a follower of Digambara Jainism, the names of his father, brother and teacher, and above all, the popularity of his work and provenance of manuscripts of his work, go to indicate that he must have been a Southerner, probably an Āndhra with close contacts with Karnāṭaka. The inclusion of some Deśya words like *दोडि सायंभोजनम्* which cannot be traced to Hemacandra's *Deśināma-mālā*, and may be traced in the Dravidian languages, goes to confirm the above view.

\* \* \* \*

## THE APPENDICES

There are in this Volume seven appendices. The first of these gives the Sūtrapāṭha of Trivikramaśabdānuśāsana in which Sūtras are given in their natural order, divided into adhyāyas and pādas. Below on the same page I have given corresponding sūtras from Hemacandra's Grammar with their pāda and sūtra numbers. It is easy for the reader to compare and judge how far Trivikrama has based his sūtras on those of Hemacandra, and what new additions he has made. The second appendix gives the sūtras of Trivikrama in the alphabetical order with page references as also the adhyāya, pāda and sūtra number. In the third appendix I have given

the so-called metrical form of the sūtras of Trivikrama from Bhaṭṭanātha Swamin's pamphlet with suitable changes to agree with our sūtra text. A special note on this appendix is given below. The fourth appendix gives in alphabetical order the first line of the Apabhraṃśa verses which Trivikrama has taken from Hemacandra's Grammar along with their references to the latter. The fifth appendix gives, in alphabetical order, the Deśya or Deśī words found in Trivikrama's work together with suitable references to HD or Hemacandra's *Deśināmamālā*, whenever possible. A special note on this appendix is given below. The sixth appendix gives the so-called Dhātuvādeśas. See also a special note below. The seventh appendix gives the text of Metrical Grammar of Prakrits found in Bharata's *Nāṭyaśāstra*, XVII. 7-25; 59-63. The text given is from the GOS edition, Vol. II, with some emendations (marked with \*) and a summary of his teachings in English for the benefit of the reader who may not be able to follow the text of Bharata.

It was possible for me to give a general index of all Prakrit words with their equivalents in Sanskrit, but I dropped the idea because we have now several dictionaries of Prakrit available, and the reader can use them with ease.

*The third appendix* gives the sūtras of Trivikrama in a metrical form. Although I do not consider that Trivikrama wrote his Prakrit Grammar in verse, I thought it fit to discuss this question, because in the Sanskrit introduction to Trivikrama's Grammar in the Grantha Pradarśanī Series, the learned editor, Paṇḍita Venkaṭa Ranganātha Sharma, and Bhaṭṭanātha Swamin in his article on Trivikrama in IA, have stated that the sūtras of Trivikrama are metrical in form. See for instance, Pandit Sharma's statement :

एवमध्यत्रयत्रयस्य व्याकरणस्य सर्वाणि सूत्राणि छन्दोऽध्याया-  
पन्नानित्ययमंशोऽस्मिन्पुनर्व्यपादानां श्री श्रीनिवासभट्टनाथाचार्यवरगुरुणामुपज्ञा ।  
अत एव एतस्मिन्मुद्रणे सूत्रपाठस्तैः शोधितमातृकानुसारेणैव मुद्रितः ॥

It appears that there was some tradition which indicated that Trivikrama's Grammar was written in a metrical form. This tradition seems to have been translated into action by

this editor. Bhaṭṭanātha Swamin also published, at the request of the late Dr. T. K. Laddu, the sūtras in the metrical form in a pamphlet. I have reproduced this metrical form of the sūtras with some necessary modification so that the sūtras should agree in wording with those in this edition.

I must admit that there have been instances of grammatical sūtras being written in a metrical form. Bharata, for instance, wrote his description of the characteristics of the Prakrit Language and its dialects in a metrical form (See Appendix VII to this volume). Mārkaṇḍeya wrote his *Prākṛta-Sarvasva* in Kārikās. Rāmaśarmatarkavāgīśa also wrote his *Prākṛta-Kalpataru* in a metrical form. In all these instances, the versification, though the subject-matter is terse and dry, seem to possess some qualities of verse. The topics are treated in a suitable metrical form, and their versification has some characteristics and qualities of musical tunes. Trivikrama's sūtras, as given in this appendix, do not possess even a shade of these qualities. I must, however, admit that there are some sūtras of Trivikrama, for instance, प्राथो लिति न विकल्पः 1. 1. 14, which lend support to the view that such sūtras have metrical tunes; but the vast majority of the sūtras do not possess any such characteristics. There are no introductory nor concluding stanzas. Most of the sūtras are put, mechanically, into the form of Āryā or Anuṣṭubh metre. The sūtras are cut up anywhere, e.g., see the stanzas 19, 20, 23, 33, 48, 92, 96, 97, 100, 104, 126, 135, 136, 143, 148, 153, 159, 161, 165, 167, 173, 174, 183, 184, 185, 187, 188, 189, 191, 194, 196, 197, 198. The adhyāya ends and pāda ends have no indication, and the stanza is not completed at such places; e.g., see 1. 1.; 1. 3; 1. 4; 2. 1; 2. 2; 2. 4; 3. 1; 3. 2; 3. 3; and 3. 4. Even the last stanza of the work is left incomplete. I would, therefore, request the reader to compare the versification of Trivikrama's sūtras with that of Bharata, Mārkaṇḍeya and Rāmaśarma Tarkavāgīśa, and decide for himself whether he agrees with the views of Bhaṭṭanāthaswamin.

Trivikrama claims for his verification the qualities of a sweet and pleasing sound :

विशन्नन्तः श्रोत्रं पदमधुरिमा मेदुरयति.

Let the reader judge for himself whether the metrical form of the sūtras as printed in this appendix would justify this claim! Even the Kārikās giving the list of anit roots, शक्लृपच्, etc., are more sonorous than the Kārikās of Trivikrama. I therefore do not think that Trivikrama ever wrote his sūtras in that form.

*The fifth Appendix* contains some 1600 Deśya or Deśī words which are recorded in Trivikrama's Grammar. About the implications of the term Deśya or Deśī, the reader is referred to my article : *Observations on Hemacandra's Deśī-nāmamālā*, ABORI, VIII. pp. 63-71, and more particularly to Hemacandra's definition of Deśī :

जे लक्खणे ण सिद्धा ण पसिद्धा सक्कयाहिहाणेसु ।

ण य गउणलक्खणासत्तिसंभवा ते इह णिबद्धा ॥

देसविसेसपसिद्धीइ भण्णमाणा अणन्तया हुन्ति ।

तम्हा अणाइपाइअपयट्टभासाविसेसओ देसी ॥ HD. I. 3-4.

Modern philology has made considerable advance in recent years to find fault with the above definition of the term Deśī; but, we owe to Hemacandra a deep debt of gratitude to have preserved for us a tremendously exhaustive list of such words and their senses. It is possible to discover a few more Deśī words, some of which we find incorporated in Trivikrama's Grammar. It is easy to prove that Trivikrama has drawn largely upon Hemacandra's vocabulary of such Deśī words, and I have tried to trace as many of such words as was possible for me to do; but I was not able to trace some, because my manuscripts could not give me any clue as to their correct form, or because Trivikrama has added them anew from contemporary sources or sources later than Hemacandra.

Trivikrama gives the Deśī words in a classified form as under :

(1) वा पुआय्याद्याः 1. 2. 109, saying that it is possible to explain the forms as derived from Sanskrit due to change in the vowel-structure : स्वराद्यादेशविशेषिताः;

(2) गोणाद्याः 1. 3. 105, saying that he does not attempt to trace the original basic word or its prefixes and suffixes or changes in the form due to dropping or change of letters : अनुक्त्प्रकृतिप्रत्ययलोपागमवर्णविकाराः ;

(3) गहिआद्याः 1. 4. 121, saying that some sort of Etymological explanation can be found for words in the list : निर्वचनगोचराः ;

(4) वरङ्त्तगास्तृनाद्यैः 2. 1. 30, saying that the words listed have some Taddhita pratyayas or suffixes, coupled with some changes in vowels etc : स्वराद्यादेशविशेषिताः ;

(5) अपुण्यगाः केन 3. 1. 132, saying that the list contains past passive participles in क्त, either from roots traceable to Sanskrit or Deśī stock : क्तप्रत्ययेन सह निपात्यन्ते; and

(6) झाडगास्तु देश्याः सिद्धाः 3. 4. 72, saying that the words listed are pure deśī words known to exist in popular literature and no attempt is made to trace them to Sanskrit : देशविशेष-व्यवहारानुपलभ्यमानाः सिद्धाः निष्पन्नाः प्रसिद्धा वा. It is words listed here which have come down to us in the most corrupt form, and my attempt to trace them to HD have failed in some cases.

*The Sixth Appendix* contains the Dhātuvādesas arranged alphabetically. It is divided into two parts, Part I giving Sanskrit roots with their Prakrit Substitutes, and Part II giving Prakrit substitutes for Sanskrit roots. Hemacandra has given the list of these substitutes in his Grammar in the fourth pāda, and has arranged the roots according to the initial letter in their Sanskrit form such as कथ्, गम् etc. Trivikrama does not seem to follow any definite principle in giving these substitutes; he has cut them up into 2. 4 and 3. 1, and also in 3. 4. I have collected all the so-called substitutes from Trivikrama and given them in the two parts. It would not be very difficult for the reader to compare the Prakrit substitutes in Part II with a similar list from Hemacandra's Grammar given at the end on pages 117\*-128\* of the revised edition of the work published as Appendix to Kumārapālacarita in Bombay Sanskrit and Prakrit Series, No. LX, or on pages 407-416 in its reprint to be soon published.

In this connection it should be noted that Hemacandra held that the so-called Dhātvādesās were in reality roots drawn from the stock of Deśī vocables, and that they were shown technically as substitutes for Sanskrit roots with the simple object that they could, that way, be used to form verbal derivatives with the help of suffixes. Note particularly the following passage from Hemacandra :

एते चान्यैर्देशीयु पठिता अपि अस्माभिर्धात्वादेशीकृताः विविधेषु प्रत्ययेषु  
प्रतिष्ठन्तामिति । तथा च—वज्जरिओ कथितः । वज्जरिऊण कथयित्वा । वज्जरणं  
कथनम् । वज्जरन्तो कथयन् । वज्जरिअव्वं कथयितव्यम् । इति रूपसहस्राणि च  
सिध्यन्ति । संस्कृतधातुवच्च प्रत्ययलोपागमादिविधिः ॥ हेव्या—4. 2.

\* \* \* \*

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### A TEXTS ON PRAKRIT GRAMMAR

- Audāryacintāmaṇi* of Śrutasāgara (Sūtrapāṭha only) by Bhaṭṭa-nāthaswamin (pp. 29-44). No date.
- Prākṛta-Kalpataṇu* of Rāmaśarman Tarkavagīśa, edited by L. Nitti-Dolci, Śākhā I, Paris 1939.
- Prākṛta-Lakṣaṇam* of Caṇḍa, ed. by Herule, A. S. B., Calcutta, 1880.
- Prākṛta-prakāśa* of Varatuci with the Manoranā Comin. of Bhāmaha, ed. by E. B. Cowell, Hertford, England; 1st Edition 1854; 2nd edition 1868; Revised edition in Poona Oriental Series by Dr. P. L. Vaidya, Poona, 1931; with Commentaries: *Prākṛtasaṃjīvanī* by Vasantarāja, and *Subodhini* by Sadānanda, Sarasvatī Bhavan Series, Benaras, 1927.
- Prākṛta-Maṇi-Dīpa* of Appaya Dīkṣita, Part I, Oriental Research Institute, Mysore, Publication No. 92, ed. by T. T. Srinivasagopalacarya with his subcommentary, 1953.
- Prākṛtamanjari*, attributed to Kātyavān, N. S. Press, Bombay, 1913.
- Prākṛta-Rupavatara* of Sumharāja, ed. by E. Hultzsch, Royal Asiatic Society, Prize Publication Fund, No. 1, London, 1909.
- Prākṛta-Sarvasva* of Markaṇḍeya, ed. by S. P. Bhaṭṭanāthaswamin, Grantha Pradarśanī, Vizagapatam, 1927.
- Prākṛtānuśāsana* of Puṇḍottama, ed. by L. Nitti-Dolci, Paris, 1938.
- Prākṛta-Vyākaraṇa* of Trivikrama, Adhyaya I, ed. in *Grantha Pradarśanī*, Vizagapatam, 1896.
- Siddha-Hema-Śabdānuśāsana* or *Hemacandra's Prakrit Grammar* (HG; ६३५१), ed. by R. Pischel, Halle, 1877-1880; BSPS No. LX (Appendix to *Kumārapālacarita*), ed. by S. P. Pandit; Revised edition, 1936, by Dr. P. L. Vaidya.

- Ṣaḍbhāṣācandrikā* (C) of Laṣkmīdhara, ed. by K. P. Trivedi, BSPP, No. LXXI, Poona, 1916.
- Trivikrama-Sūtrapāṭha* (metrical) Published by Bhaṭṭanāthaswamin, pages 1-28. No date.

**B—GENERAL WORKS ON PRAKRIT GRAMMAR**

- LASSEN C. *Institutiones Linguae Pracriticæ*, Bonn, 1837.
- MEHENDALE M. A., *Historical Grammar of Inscriptional Prakrits*, Poona 1948.
- NITTI-DOLCI L. *Les Grammariens Prakrits*, Paris, 1938.
- PISCHEL R. *Grammatik der Prakrit Sprachen (Grundriss)*, Strassburg, 1900.
- SIRCAR D. C. *A Grammar of the Prakrit Language*, University of Calcutta, 1943.
- SUKUMAR SEN, *Comparative Grammar of Middle Indo-Aryan* Linguistic Society of India, Calcutta 1951.
- TAGARE G. V. *Historical Grammar of Apabhramśa*, Poona 1948.

**C—SELECT ARTICLES AND PAPERS ON PRAKRITS**

- ALSDORF L. *A Specimen of Archaic Jaina-Mahārāṣṭrī*, Indian and Iranian Studies presented to G. A. Grierson, School of Oriental Studies, London, VIII, 1936.
- ALSDORF L. *Apabhramśa Studien*, Leipzig 1937.
- A. BANERJĠ-ŚASTRI. *The Evolution of Māgadhi*, Oxford 1922.
- BHAṬṬANĀTHASWAMIN, *Trivikrama and his followers*, IA, XL, pp. 219-223.
- BLOCH TH. *Vararuci und Hemacandra*, Gutersloh 1893.
- CHATTERJĠ S. K. *Calcutta Hindusthani: A study of Jargon dialect*, Lahore, 1931.
- CLERK W. E. *Māgadhi and Ardhamāgadhi*, JAOS, XLIV.
- GHATAGE A. M. *Māhārāṣṭrī Language and Literature*, Journal of the Uni. of Bombay, IV, 6, May 1936.
- GHATAGE A. M. *Introduction to Ardhamāgadhi*, Kolhapur, 1942.

- GHOSH M. M. Prakrit Verses of Bharata-Nāṭyaśāstra, IHQ VIII, 1932.
- GHOSH M. M. Māhārāṣṭrī, a later phase of Śaurasenī, Journal of the Dept. of Letters, Calcutta University, XXIII, 1933.
- GRIERSON G. A. The Prakrit Vibhāṣās, JRAS. 1918, pp. 489–517.
- GRIERSON G. A. The Śaurasenī and Māgadhī Stabakas of Prākṛita-Kalpatāru, IA. LVI–LVII. (Supplement).
- GRIERSON G. A. The Eastern School of Prakrit Grammarians, Sir Asutosh Mukerji Silver Jubilee Vol. III ii, pp. 119–141.
- GRIERSON G. A. The Prakrit Dhātuvādeśas, Mem. Asiatic Society of Bengal, VIII, No. 2, 1924.
- GRIERSON G. A. Paisācī and Cūlikāpaisācī, IA. LII, pp. 16–17.
- GRIERSON G. A. The Apabhraṃśa Stabakas of Prākṛita-Kalpatāru, IA, LI, pp. 13–28 ; LII, 197 ff.
- GRIERSON G. A. Paisācī in Prākṛita-Kalpatāru, IA., pp. 114 ff.
- GRIERSON G. A. Apabhraṃśa according to Mārkaṇḍeya and Dhakki Prakrit, JRAS 1913, pp. 875–883.
- GRIERSON G. A. The Pronunciation of Prakrit Palatals, JRAS. 1913, pp. 391–396.
- GRIERSON G. A. The Bṛhatkathā in Mārkaṇḍeya, JRAS. 1913, p. 319.
- HULTZSCH E. Neue Beiträge Zur Kenntnis der Śaurasenī, ZDMG, 66 (1912) pp. 709–726.
- KATRE S. M. Prakrit Languages and their Contribution to Indian Culture, Bhāratiya Vidyā Bhavan, Bombay, 1945.
- LADDU T. K. Prolegomena Zu Trivikramas Prakrit Grammatik, Halle, 1912 ; English translation by P. V. Ramanujaswamin, ABORI, X, pp. 177–218.
- PISCHEL R. Materialien Zur Kenntnis des Apabhraṃśa, Berlin, 1902.
- RAMANUJASWAMIN P. V. Hemacandra and Paisācī Prakrit, IA. 1922, pp. 51–54.

RANGANATHASWAMIN Paisācī Dialect, IA 1920, p. 114.

SCHMIDT R. Elementarbuch der Śaurasenī, Hannover, 1924.

UPADHYE A. N. Kanarese Words in Deśi Lexicons, ABORI, XII, 3, pp. 274-284.

UPADHYE A. N. A Note on Trivikrama's Date, ABORI, XIII, pp. 171-172.

UPADHYE A. N. Paisācī Language and Literature, ABORI, XXI, pp. 1-37.

UPADHYE A. N. Vālmikisūtra : A Myth, Bhāratīya Vidyā, Vol. II ii, pp. 160-176.

UPADHYE A. N. Śubhacandra and his Prakrit Grammar, ABORI, XIII, pp. 37-58.

VAIDYA P. L. Observations on Hemacandra's Deśināmamālā, ABORI, VIII, pp. 63-71.

VAIDYA P. L. On the use of Prakrit Dialects in Sanskrit Dramas, ABORI, XXXIII, pp. 15-25.

WOOLNER A. C. Introduction to Prakrit, Lahore, 1917.

#### D—MISCELLANEOUS

*Deśināmamālā* (HD) of Hemacandra, ed. by R. Pischel and G. Bühler, BSS. No. XVII ; Revised edition by P. V. Ramanujaswami, Poona, 1938.

*Pāṇalacchī Nāmamālā* of Dhanapāla, ed. G. Bühler, Gottingen, 1879.

---

श्रीत्रिविक्रमदेव-विरचितं

# प्राकृतशब्दानुशासनम्

स्वोपज्ञवृत्तियुतम्



॥ श्रीः ॥

## श्रीत्रिविक्रमदेवविरचितं स्वोपज्ञवृत्तियुतं

### प्राकृतशब्दानुशासनम् ।

श्रीवीरप्राच्याचलसमुदितमखिलप्रकाशकं वन्दे ।  
दिव्यध्वनिपटुदीधितिमहमक्षरपद्धतिप्राप्त्यै ॥ १ ॥  
श्रुतभर्तुरर्हानन्दित्रैविद्यमुनेः पदाम्बुजभ्रमरः ।  
श्रीबाणसुकुलकमलद्युमणेरादित्यवर्मणः पौत्रः ॥ २ ॥  
श्रीमल्लिनाथपुत्रो लक्ष्मीगर्भामृताम्बुधिसुधांशुः ।  
भामस्य वृत्तविद्याधाम्नो भ्राता त्रिविक्रमः सुकविः ॥ ३ ॥  
श्रीवीरसेनजिनसेनार्यादिवचःपयोधिपूरात्कतिचित् ।  
प्राकृतपदरत्नानि प्रकृतिकृती सुकृतिभूषणाय चिनोति ॥ ४ ॥

Of the six Mss. consulted for this edition, K begins :  
श्रीमत्पंचगुह्यो नमः ॥ सरस्वत्यै नमः ॥ निर्विघ्नमस्तु. M begins : श्रीः ।  
प्राकृतव्याकरणं त्रैविक्रमीयम्. S begins : श्रीवीतरागाय नमः । शुभमस्तु ।  
निर्विघ्नमस्तु । त्रिविक्रमविरचितं प्राकृतव्याकरणम्. T श्रीः । प्राकृतव्याकरणम् । हरिः  
ॐ । शुभमस्तु । ॐ. INTRODUCTORY STANZAS : 1. (cd) S °प्राप्त्यै  
for °प्राप्त्यै; T<sub>1</sub> दिव्यध्वनिपटु...प्राप्त्यै; T<sub>3</sub> दिव्यध्वन्यपरदीधितिमहमक्षर°.  
2. (a) K श्रुतभक्तिर्; M श्रीभर्तुर्; S श्रुतभक्तिर् for श्रुतभर्तुर्. T<sub>1</sub> damaged:  
(c) GM श्रीबाणसुकुल° for श्रीबाणसुकुल°. (d) K °द्युमणिर् corr. to °द्युम-  
णेर्; S °द्युमणिर् for °द्युमणेर्. K °शर्मणः for °वर्मणः. 3. (b) M °गर्भाम्बुधि°  
for °गर्भामृताम्बुधि°. (c) G सोमस्य; KS रामस्य; T<sub>1</sub> चास्य; T<sub>2</sub> चामस्य;  
T<sub>3</sub> वामस्य for भामस्य. M वृत्ति° for वृत्त°. (d) M स कविः for सुकविः  
4. (a) M °जिनार्यादि° for °जिनसेनार्यादि°. (b) T<sub>3</sub> वाच्यं for  
°वचः°. K °पयोधेः पारात्; M °पयोधिहारात्; S पयोनिधेः पारात्; T<sub>3</sub>  
°पयोनिधेः पूरात् for °पयोधिपूरात्. K S om. कतिचित्. (c) G प्राकृतकृति।  
K प्राकृतिकृति; S प्रकृतिकृति; T<sub>1</sub> प्रकृतीकृती for प्रकृतिकृती. (d) T<sub>1</sub> सुकृती  
for सुकृति°. M चिनोमि; T<sub>3</sub> विचिनोति for चिनोति.

अनल्पार्थः सुखोच्चारः शब्दः साहित्यजीवितम् ।  
 स च प्राकृतमेवेति मतं सूत्रानुवर्तिनाम् ॥ ५ ॥  
 प्राकृतं तत्समं देश्यं तद्भवं चेत्यदाल्लिधा ।  
 तत्समं संस्कृतसमं नेयं संस्कृतलक्षणा ॥ ६ ॥  
 देश्यमार्थं च रूढत्वात्स्वतन्त्रत्वाच्च भूयसा ।  
 लक्ष्म नापेक्षते, तस्य संप्रदायो हि बोधकः ॥ ७ ॥  
 प्रकृतेः संस्कृतात्साध्यमानात्सिद्धाच्च यद्भवेत् ।  
 प्राकृतस्यास्य लक्ष्यानुरोधि लक्ष्म प्रचक्ष्महे ॥ ८ ॥  
 प्राकृतपदार्थसार्थप्राप्त्यै निजसूत्रमार्गमनुजिगमिषताम् ।  
 वृत्तिर्यथार्थसिद्ध्यै त्रिविक्रमेणागमक्रममाक्रियते ॥ ९ ॥  
 तद्भवतत्समदेश्यप्राकृतरूपाणि पश्यतां विदुषाम् ।  
 दर्पणति येयमवनौ वृत्तिर्लैविक्रमी जयति ॥ १० ॥  
 प्राकृतरूपाणि यथा प्राच्यैरा हेमचन्द्रार्यात् ।  
 विवृतानि तथा तानि प्रतिबिम्बन्तीह सर्वाणि ॥ ११ ॥

5. (a)G अनल्पार्थसुखोच्चारः. (b) B शब्दसाहित्य° for शब्दः साहित्य°. (d) KS सूक्तानु° for सूत्रानु°. 6. (d) GS °लक्षणात् for °लक्ष्मणा. 7. (a) Gp देश्यमार्थसवृक्षत्वात् (sic). (c) BT नापेक्ष्यते for नापेक्षते. 9. (a) K °पदार्थस्यार्थप्राप्त्यै for पदार्थसार्थप्राप्त्यै. (d) GM °णागमक्रमेण क्रियते; K °णागमः क्रियते for °णागमक्रमाक्रियते. 10. (a) G तत्समतद्भव°; T<sub>1</sub> तद्भवतत्सं-देश्य° for तद्भवतत्सम°. (c) BM दर्पणतथैवमवनौ; K दर्पणयति येयमवनौ; T<sub>1</sub> दर्पणतथैवमवनौ; T<sub>2-3</sub> दर्पणतथेयमवनौ. (d) B जयतु for जयति. 11. (b) B T<sub>1</sub> प्राच्यैरा हेमचन्द्रास्यात्; G प्राच्यैराहेमचन्द्रमाचार्यैः; Gp प्राचेतसहेमचन्द्राद्यात्; S प्राच्यैरा हेमचन्द्रार्यात्. (d) After सर्वाणि Gp adds : छाया गीर्वाणवाण्याः षट् सर्वलोकसमर्चिताः । प्रतिभान्ति सदा श्रीदा गायत्र्या इव कुक्षयः ॥११॥ मनुष्याणां हि सर्वेषां वागर्थमनुवर्तते । कवीनां तु समर्थानां वाचमर्थोऽनुवर्तते ॥ २ ॥

## सिद्धिरिह ॥ १ ॥

सिद्धिरिह प्रस्तुता प्राकृतशब्दसंबन्धिनी परिगृह्यते । सा च लोका-  
द्भवति । यस्मात् ऋलृवर्णाभ्यामैकारौकाराभ्यामसंयुक्तऽनकाराभ्यां शषाभ्यां  
द्विवचनादिना च रहितः शब्दोच्चारो लोकव्यवहारादेवोपलभ्यते, देस्याश्च  
शब्दाः, तस्मात्सिद्धिरिहोक्तादिति वेदितव्यम् । चकाराद्वक्ष्यमाणाच्च लक्षणादनै-  
कान्ताच्च ॥ १ ॥

## अनुक्तमन्यशब्दानुशासनवत् ॥ २ ॥

यदिह स्वरादिसंज्ञात्वेन संधिप्रभृतिकार्यत्वेन चानुक्तं तदन्यशब्दानु-  
शासनवत् । कौमारजैनेन्द्रपाणिनीयप्रभृतिषु व्याकरणेषु यथोक्तं तथैव  
वेदितव्यम् ॥ २ ॥

## संज्ञा प्रत्याहारमयी वा ॥ ३ ॥

इह प्राकृतव्याकरणे संज्ञा प्रत्याहारस्वरूपा व्यवहियते । वाग्रहणा-  
द्वक्ष्यमाणाच्च । पुनः प्रत्याहारग्रहणं भूयोव्यवहारप्रदर्शनार्थम् । यथा—स्वरः  
अच् ; ए ओ एङ् ; ऐ औ ऐच् ; व्यञ्जनं हल् ; र्वादिः सुप् ; त्यादिः तिङ् ;  
इत्यादि ॥ ३ ॥

Sūtra 1. K om. सिद्धिरिह. B om. प्रस्तुता. BT<sub>1</sub> प्राकृतसंबन्धिनी;  
KST<sub>2-3</sub> प्राकृतशब्दार्थसंबन्धिनी; M प्राकृतपदसंबन्धिनी for प्राकृतशब्दसंबन्धिनी.  
B गृह्यते; K परिगृह्यते for परिगृह्यते. KS चैकारौकाराभ्यां; M ऐऔभ्यां for  
ऐकारौकाराभ्यां. B असंयुक्त° for असंयुक्त°; M om. असंयुक्त°. M om.  
शषाभ्यां. B om. च. K विरहितः for रहितः. M वक्ष्यमाणालक्षणात् for  
वक्ष्यमाणाक्षणात्. GT<sub>3</sub> अनेकान्तालक्षणाच्च for अनेकान्ताच्च. 2. B om. संधि-  
प्रभृतिकार्यत्वेन च. T<sub>1-2</sub> °नानुक्तं for चानुक्तं. BMT<sub>1-2</sub> तत्सर्वमन्य° for तदन्य°.°  
KS °पाणिनीयादिव्याक°; T<sub>3</sub> °जैनेन्द्रब्राह्मचन्द्रपाणिनीय° for °पाणिनीयप्रभृतिषु  
व्याक°. BT<sub>1-2</sub> तत्तथैवेति for तथैव. 3. T<sub>3</sub> प्रत्याहाररूपा for प्रत्याहार-  
स्वरूपा. M वक्ष्यमाणाक्षणाच्च for वक्ष्यमाणाच्च. M पुनर्ग्रहणं for पुनःप्रत्याहार-  
ग्रहणं. G व्यवहारस्य दर्शनार्थम्; T व्यवहारदर्शनार्थम् for व्यवहारप्रदर्शनार्थम्.  
K स्वादिषु सुप् for स्वादिः सुप्.

सुप्स्वादिरन्त्यहला ॥ ४ ॥

सुप्सु स्वादिषु विभक्तिषु आदिर्वर्णो वचनं वा अन्यहला अन्त्य-  
व्यञ्जनेन सह इत्संज्ञो भवति । यथा—सु औ जस्, सुस्; अम् औट् शस्, अस्;  
एवं टास्, डेस्, डसिस्, डम्, डिप् । पञ्चम्या डस् इति वक्तव्ये डसिस्  
इति डसः षष्ठ्यैकवचनस्य संदेहार्थम् ॥ ४ ॥

हो ह्रस्वः ॥ ५ ॥

एकमात्रो यो वर्णो ह्रस्व इति प्रसिद्धस्तस्य ह इति संज्ञा ॥ ५ ॥

दिर्दीर्घः ॥ ६ ॥

द्विमात्रो यो वर्णो दीर्घ इति रूढस्तस्य दिः इति संज्ञा ॥ ६ ॥

शषसाः शुः ॥ ७ ॥

श ष स इत्येते वर्णाः शुसंज्ञका भवन्ति ॥ ७ ॥

सः समासः ॥ ८ ॥

समासः ससंज्ञको भवति ॥ ८ ॥

4. S सुप्स्वादिषु for सुप्सु स्वादिषु. K आदिर्वर्णो for आदिर्वर्णो. T सहसंज्ञा भवन्ति for सहेत्संज्ञो भवति. KS om. यथा. B om. एवं. B reads: टा भ्यां भिस् टास्; डे, भ्यां भ्यस् डेस्; डसि भ्यां भ्यस् डसिस्; इस् ओस् आम् डम्; डि ओस् सुप् डिप् for टास्...डिप्. B om. वक्तव्ये. M S इति तु for इति. 5. For Sūtras 5 and 6, M reads दि दीर्घः हो ह्रस्वः, but the order of the Com. is as in our text. M एकमात्रवर्णो for एकमात्रो यो वर्णो. G वर्णो थो; S om. वर्णो. S हा इति. for ह इति. T<sub>3</sub> adds भवति after संज्ञा. 6. K M S दि दीर्घः for the Sūtra. B GT<sub>1</sub> यो द्विमात्रो; M यो द्विमात्रको for द्विमात्रो यो. G प्रसिद्धः for रूढः. K M दि; ST दी for दिः. 7. M शुम्; T<sub>1,3</sub> शु for शुः in the Sūtra. G इत्येते त्रयो वर्णाः for इत्येते वर्णाः. K M शुसंज्ञा; S सुसंज्ञा for शुसंज्ञका. 8 K M S ससंज्ञो for ससंज्ञको.

आदिः खुः ॥ ९ ॥

आदिर्वर्णः खुसंज्ञको भवति ॥ ९ ॥

गो गणपरः ॥ १० ॥

आदिरिति वर्तते । गणप्रधानो य आदिशब्दः स गसंज्ञको भवति ।  
यथा गुणादिरित्यादौ गुणग इत्यादि ॥ १० ॥

द्वितीयः फुः ॥ ११ ॥

शब्दस्य द्वितीयो वर्णः फुसंज्ञको भवति ॥ ११ ॥

संयुक्तं स्तु ॥ १२ ॥

व्यञ्जनेन युक्तं संयुक्तम्, तस्य स्तु इति संज्ञा ॥ १२ ॥

तु विकल्पे ॥ १३ ॥

विकल्पे विभाषायां तु शब्दः प्रयुज्यते वाशब्दवत् ॥ १३ ॥

प्रायो लिति न विकल्पः ॥ १४ ॥

यः कार्यार्थं सूत्रेऽनुबध्यते न तु प्रयोगे दृश्यते स इत् । अनुबन्ध  
इति व्याकरणान्तरे लक्षणम् । लकारः इत् यस्यासौ लित् । लिति कार्ये विकल्पः  
प्रायो न भवति ॥ १४ ॥

शिति दीर्घः ॥ १५ ॥

शानुबन्धे कार्ये सति पूर्वस्य स्वरस्य दीर्घो भवति । यथा 'शि श्लुङ्'  
न पुनरिति तु [ १-१-२८ ] । अत्र नपुनःशब्दे अन्त्यव्यञ्जनस्य शानुबन्धे-  
कारलोपयोः पूर्वस्याचो दीर्घः । णउणाइ, णउणा ॥ १५ ॥

9. T<sub>1</sub> आदिओ for the Sūtra. G आदिर्वर्णः; MS om. वर्णः. S खुसंज्ञो;  
T<sub>1</sub> असंज्ञको for खुसंज्ञको. 10. G आदिरित्यनुवर्तते. Gp तस्य गसंज्ञा भवति; K  
M S स गसंज्ञो भवति. 11. M फुः for फुः in the Sūtra. M फुसंज्ञो; S  
फुसंज्ञो for फुसंज्ञको. 12. B Gp T संयुक्तः स्तुः; M संयुक्तस्तु for the Sūtra.  
G व्यञ्जनेन संयुक्तो वर्णः स्तुसंज्ञको भवति; M व्यञ्जनेन युक्तस्य स्तु इति संज्ञा. 14.  
T<sub>1</sub> प्रत्ययो for प्रायो in the Sūtra. B om. प्रयोगे. BT<sub>1,2</sub> सोऽनुबन्ध इति  
व्याकरणान्तरे लक्षणम्. G यस्य स for यस्यासौ. 15. S शिति for शिति in the  
Sūtra. G पूर्वस्याचो for पूर्वस्य स्वरस्य. K M S शानुबन्धयोरीकारलोपयोः  
for शानुबन्धेकारलोपयोः. M om. णउणाइ णउणा; B T add पक्षे णउण  
after णउणा.